

COCHISE COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FINAL MINUTES
April 13, 2016
REGULAR MEETING at 4:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Cochise County Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chairman Greene at the Cochise County Complex, 1415 Melody Lane, Building G, Bisbee, Arizona in the Board of Supervisors' Hearing Room. Chairman Greene admonished the public to turn off cell phones, use the speaker request forms provided, and to address the Commission from the podium using the microphone. He explained the time allotted to speakers when at the podium. He then explained the composition of the Commission, and indicated that there were five Special Use Dockets and one Special Use Modification Docket on the agenda. Chairman Greene explained the consequences of a potential tie vote and the process for approval and appeal.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Greene noted the presence of a quorum and called the roll, asking the Commissioners to introduce themselves and indicate the respective District they represent; seven Commissioners (Carmen Miller, Gary Brauchla, Tom Borer, Patrick Greene, Liza Weissler, Nathan Watkins and Pat Edie indicated their presence. Staff members present included; Paul Esparza, Planning Director; Jesse Drake, Planning Manager; Britt Hanson, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney; Peter Gardner, Planner I; and Jim Henry, Planner I.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion: Approve minutes of the March 9, 2016 meeting Action: Approve

Moved by: Mr. Watkins **Seconded by:** Ms. Weissler

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 5, No = 0, Abstain = 2)

Yes: Ms. Miller, Mr. Greene, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

No: 0

Abstain: Mr. Brauchla and Mr. Borer

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

Mr. Jack Cook of Bisbee spoke on matters of personal concern.

OLD BUSINESS

Item 1 PUBLIC HEARING Docket SU-16-01 (AEPCO)

A request for approval of a solar energy project in phases on approximately 202 acres of Heavy Industry (HI) and RU-4, D-Rural zoned property in and around the Arizona Electric Power Cooperative Inc. plant site located at 3525 N. Highway 191 in Cochise AZ. The applicant is Arizona Electric Power Cooperative Inc.

Chairman Greene called for the Planning Director's report. Planner Jim Henry presented the Docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Mr. Henry also explained Staff's analysis of the request. He closed by listing factors in favor of and against approval and invited questions from the Commission.

Chairman Greene then opened the Public Hearing. The Applicant's representative and attorney, Ms. Jana Flagler spoke, explaining the rationale for the requested waivers. Ms. Flagler emphasized that much of the opposition was based on the status of the subdivision as opposed to her client's proposal. She noted that the existing fossil fuel power plant had been in place for decades. She closed by inviting questions from the Commission.

Mr. Guy Shoaf of Bisbee spoke, indicating support for renewable energy in the area.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Greene closed the Public Hearing. Chairman Greene then asked for Staff's recommendation. Mr. Henry recommended Conditional Approval with the requested Modifications. Chairman Greene called for a motion. Mr. Borer made a motion of Conditional Approval, with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff. Ms. Weissler seconded the motion. Ms. Miller asked if the screening was being waived in perpetuity. Mr. Henry stated that the waiver was tied to the solar plant use only. Ms. Miller asked about cooperation with Game and Fish. Mr. Henry stated that the County could not require such cooperation, but noted that the Applicant was cooperating with Game and Fish. There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Motion: Motioned to Approve the Docket with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff

Moved by: Mr. Borer **Seconded by:** Ms. Weissler

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Ms. Miller, Mr. Brauchla, Mr. Borer, Mr. Greene, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Item 2 PUBLIC HEARING SU-06-14C (CQ Palominas)

A request for a Special Use modification to approve a new wall sign and an over-height sign at the Copper Queen Palominas Clinic, a 1.76-acre, R-36, Residential zoned property located at 10524 Highway 92, Hereford, Arizona. The Applicant is Copper Queen Community Hospital/Palominas-Hereford Clinic.

Chairman Greene called for the Planning Director's report. Planning Manager Jesse Drake presented the Docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Ms. Drake also explained Staff's analysis of the request, including the requested Modifications. She noted the support and opposition received, and closed by listing factors in favor of and against approval and then invited questions from the Commission. Chairman Greene asked for clarification that the sign was a replacement for the existing sign.

Chairman Greene then opened the Public Hearing. The Applicant's representative, Mr. Guy Shoaf spoke, explaining the request, noting that the request was a compromise solution after concerns were raised at the previous meeting regarding the sign height and base. Mr. Shoaf showed other signs in the area, and explained how the Applicant had worked to design the sign in a way that would comply with the Southern San Pedro Area Plan.

There being no speakers, Chairman Greene closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Weissler commented on several of the signs and lights that Mr. Shoaf showed in his presentation. Mr.

Watkins and Ms. Miller thanked the Applicant and Staff for working together to find a compromise solution. Chairman Greene then asked for Staff's recommendation. Ms. Drake recommended Conditional Approval with the requested Modifications. Chairman Greene called for a motion. Ms. Weissler made a motion of Conditional Approval, with the Conditions recommended by Staff. Ms. Miller seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Motion: Motioned to Approve the Docket with the Conditions recommended by Staff

Moved by: Ms. Weissler **Seconded by:** Ms. Miller

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No =0, Abstain =0)

Yes: Ms. Miller, Mr. Brauchla, Mr. Borer, Mr. Greene, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

No: 0

Abstain: 0

NEW BUSINESS

Item 3 PUBLIC HEARING Docket SU-16-03 (Levine)

A request for a Special Use modification to approve a dog kennel/animal boarding facility on a 39-acre RU-4, Rural zoned property located at 6475 S. Jeffords Trail, Willcox, AZ. The proposed use is considered a Special Use in RU-4 Rural Zoning Districts under Section 607.06 of the Zoning Regulations. The Applicants are Alvin and Sileigh Levine.

Chairman Greene called for the Planning Director's report. Planning Manager Jesse Drake presented the Docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Ms. Drake also explained Staff's analysis of the request, including the requested Modifications. She noted the support and opposition received, and closed by listing factors in favor of and against approval and then invited questions from the Commission.

Chairman Greene then opened the Public Hearing. Mr. Alvin Levine spoke, explaining the background and scope of the request. Mr. Levine explained the need for such a business in the area, and the input that he had received from neighboring property owners. He closed by offering to take questions.

There being no speakers in support or opposition, Chairman Greene invited the Applicant to add anything else. Mr. Levine returned to the podium to describe the construction of the kennels.

Chairman Greene closed the Public Hearing and invited discussion. Mr. Brauchla asked about the number of dogs. Mr. Levine stated that the maximum would be 12, but the intent was to keep no more than 8. Ms. Weissler asked about signage. Mr. Levine stated that the intent was for a four square foot sign at each driveway. Staff noted that those would be acceptable, and would not require additional Commission approval. Chairman Greene asked about plans to control barking. Mr. Levine stated that he did not, as the sound of dogs and coyotes were commonly heard in the neighborhood. Chairman Greene thanked Mr. Levine for his candor.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene asked for Staff's recommendation. Chairman Greene called for a motion. Mr. Watkins made a motion to approve the docket with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff. Ms. Weissler seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Motion: Motioned to Approve the Docket with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff

Moved by: Mr. Watkins **Seconded by:** Ms. Weissler

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No =0, Abstain =0)

Yes: Ms. Miller, Mr. Brauchla, Mr. Borer, Mr. Greene, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Item 4 PUBLIC HEARING SU-16-04 (Kriaris)

A request for a Special Use modification to approve a facility for the cultivation and infusion of medical marijuana on 40 acre RU-10, D-Rural zoned property located at 6952 S Covered Wagon Rd, Willcox, AZ. The Applicant is Nick Kriaris/NGK Enterprises Inc. Chairman Greene called for the Planning Director's report. Planning Manager Jesse Drake presented the Docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Ms. Drake also explained Staff's analysis of the request. Ms. Drake noted the support and opposition received, and closed by listing factors in favor of and against approval and then invited questions from the Commission. Mr. Watkins asked if the Private Maintenance Agreement would require the Applicant to maintain the roads to the County Maintained Road. Ms. Drake answered that this was correct.

Chairman Greene then opened the Public Hearing. The Applicants' representative, Mr. Adam Trenk, from the Rose Law Group spoke explaining the request noting the location and scope. He noted that the Applicant operated a Medical Marijuana Dispensary and small cultivation site in Phoenix, and that the proposed cultivation site would supply that dispensary. He stated that the subject and surrounding parcels, also controlled by the Applicant, would continue to grow pistachios and support cattle. Mr. Trenk explained that the Applicant was the end user rather than a speculator, and had a proven track record. In addition, he noted that no modifications were being requested and that the cultivation greenhouses would fit in with the other existing agricultural uses on the site. He explained the staffing and where the workers would be housed. Mr. Trenk closed by explaining the security measures and water usage.

Mr. Richard Frank expressed opposition without speaking.

Ms. Brenda Frank expressed opposition without speaking.

Ms. Cindy Traylor of Willcox spoke, opposing the project. Ms. Traylor stated that she felt that the proposal was an industrial use in a residential area. She expressed concerns about butane being used in the infusion process, fire protection, police protection, road maintenance, and odors.

Ms. Peggy Ottens of Willcox spoke, opposing the project. Ms. Ottens added concerns about the possibility of fire and the potential difficulty in firefighting efforts. She stated that she had never seen a police presence in the area other than Border Patrol. She stated that the

proposed facility would be attractive to criminals. Ms. Ottens closed by stating that the presented proposal had changed from the initial notification.

Mr. Paul Ottens of Willcox spoke, opposing the project. Mr. Ottens identified himself as a registered engineer, and expressed concerns about grading and the existence of a wash on the site. He also expressed concern about the unreliability of services, and stated that he had not received satisfactory answers to questions from the Applicant.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Greene invited the Applicant to rebut. Mr. Trenk stated that the neighborhood was rural, not residential, and the use was agricultural rather than industrial. He stated that the Applicants had fully vetted the site and were prepared to invest in the site. Mr. Trenk addressed the butane concerns stating that the Applicants also used carbon dioxide and water in the infusion process. He reminded the speakers that the Building Department would analyze the requests for code compliance. Mr. Trenk closed by noting the regulations applicable to the project and stating that existing possible illegal activities were not relevant.

Chairman Greene then closed the Public Hearing. Mr. Brauchla asked for clarification that the Commission was only approving the agricultural use. Ms. Drake stated that this was correct. Chairman Greene asked about the vetting process for employees. Mr. Trenk explained that the State performed background checks and fingerprinting on all employees prior to being granted authorization to work in the industry. He stated that there would be no migrant workers, but rather licensed, professional workers. Mr. Watkins asked about the fencing. Mr. Trenk stated that the existing barbed wire fence would remain around the site, and that there would be a ten-foot high chain link fence around the greenhouse sites per state requirements. Ms. Miller asked about light pollution. Mr. Trenk stated that there would be no grow lights on during at night. Ms. Miller asked if there would be water storage on site, which could be used for fire suppression. Mr. Trenk stated that this was correct. Chairman Greene asked about the possibility of odors. Mr. Trenk explained that charcoal filters would be used to mitigate odors. Chairman Greene asked Ms. Drake for clarification that if the request were for any other crop, other than medical marijuana would the item be before the Commission. Ms. Drake stated that it would not. Chairman Greene then asked for Staff's recommendation. Ms. Drake recommended Conditional Approval. Chairman Greene called for a motion. Ms. Weissler made a motion of Conditional Approval, with the Conditions recommended by Staff. Ms. Edie seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Motioned to Approve the Docket with the Conditions recommended by Staff

Moved by: Ms. Weissler **Seconded by:** Ms. Edie

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Ms. Miller, Mr. Brauchla, Mr. Borer, Mr. Greene, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Item 5 PUBLIC HEARING SU-16-07 (Brown)

A request for a Special Use modification to approve an animal boarding and a doggy daycare facility on a vacant 2.3-acre General Business (GB), zoned property located approximately one-

quarter mile north of the intersection of E Hazen Rd. and S. Wardle Rd. near Sierra Vista, AZ. The Applicant is Nicole Brown.

Chairman Greene called for the Planning Director's report. Planner Jim Henry presented the Docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Mr. Henry also explained Staff's analysis of the request. Mr. Henry noted the support and opposition received, and closed by listing factors in favor of and against approval and then invited questions from the Commission. Ms. Weissler asked for clarification about the location of the nearest home, and noted that other potential uses would be less intrusive than dog boarding. Mr. Henry deferred the explanation to the Applicant.

Chairman Greene then opened the Public Hearing. The Applicant, Ms. Nicole Brown spoke, explaining the request. Ms. Brown explained that the portion of the site that is closest to the adjacent home would only be used for day care during regular business hours Monday through Friday. Ms. Brown explained her experience with dog boarding for the Army and in Washington D.C., along with her personal experience with pets. She stated that the location was chosen close to town in response to requests from individuals and veterinarian clinics in Sierra Vista and Fort Huachuca. She explained the construction of the facilities and the insulation that would muffle sound. Ms. Brown also showed that the turnout areas would be oriented toward the existing commercial facilities rather than the residential areas. She explained the sound mitigation, erosion mitigation, and security measures, which would include the ability to remotely monitor the dogs. She also stated that neighbors would be able to contact an on-call employee with any problems, including noise issues. Ms. Brown closed by explaining clean up and waste disposal procedures, along with the private road maintenance.

Ms. Helen Mele of Sierra Vista spoke in opposition, expressing concern about the possibility of devaluation of their home and adjacent vacant lots of sale. Ms. Mele stated that there were other existing similar facilities not near residential areas. She compared the request to the previous docket in a rural area and stated that it was more appropriate. Ms. Mele stated that potential traffic would be a huge problem for her home and for potential buyers for her lots.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Greene invited the Applicant to rebut. Ms. Brown reminded the Commission that the site is zoned Commercial, and after annexation, the proposed use would be permitted by right. She clarified that there is currently only one other true boarding facility in operation, and that the others were vet clinics that offer overnight care. She pointed out the existing construction yard and junkyard on the road, that her patrons will, and the neighbors already drive by.

Chairman Greene then closed the Public Hearing. Ms. Weissler asked for clarification of the entrance location. Ms. Brown pointed it out on the overhead view. Mr. Borer asked for clarification of the opposition speaker's location. Mr. Henry pointed them out on the map. Chairman Greene then asked for Staff's recommendation. Mr. Henry recommended Conditional Approval with the requested Modifications. Chairman Greene called for a motion. Mr. Borer made a motion of Conditional Approval, with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff. Ms. Edie seconded the motion. Mr. Borer asked for clarification that if the parcel were annexed then the use would be permitted by right. Mr. Henry confirmed that was the case. Ms. Weissler asked for confirmation that the parcel was zoned commercial. Mr. Henry confirmed that the parcel is zoned General Business. There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Motioned to Approve the Docket with the Conditions and Modifications recommended by Staff

Moved by: Mr. Borer **Seconded by:** Ms. Edie

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 7, No =0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Ms. Miller, Mr. Brauchla, Mr. Borer, Mr. Greene, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

No: Mr. 0

Abstain: 0

Item 6 PUBLIC HEARING SU-16-05 (Canna Sun glow)

A request for a Special Use modification to approve a facility for the cultivation and infusion of medical marijuana on 3.46 acres of a 393 acre RU-4, Rural zoned property located at 14066 S Sun glow Rd, Pearce, AZ. The Applicant is Canna Consultants Inc.

Chairman Greene called for the Planning Director's report. Planning Manager Jesse Drake presented the Docket, explaining the background of the request utilizing photos, maps, and other visual aids. Ms. Drake also explained Staff's analysis of the request. Ms. Drake noted the support and opposition received, and closed by listing factors in favor of and against approval and then invited questions from the Commission.

Chairman Greene then opened the Public Hearing. The Applicant, Mr. Luke DeBatty, Vice President of Canna Consulting, spoke explaining the request. Mr. DeBatty explained that the location was chosen based on its existing commercial development. He explained his firm's background and staff. He continued with the details of the proposal, emphasizing that there would not be a Dispensary component. Mr. DeBatty also discussed security measures and the sustainability aspects of the proposal. He expounded on the water report that was submitted and their plans to capture and recycle water. He stated that there would be no light trespass based on existing technology. Mr. DeBatty closed by emphasizing their commitments to the community and medical research.

Ms. Alanna Riggs of Willcox spoke in opposition, stating that she represents the Riggs family ranches and citing concerns about water resources. She asked if the full build out could be supported by rainwater.

Ms. Mary Jones of Elfrida spoke in support. Ms. Jones noted personal experience with the benefits of medical marijuana, and that her research indicated the Applicant was a reputable organization. She stated that she sits on the Elfrida School Board, and that the Applicant had donated to the school district.

Mr. Richard Frank of Willcox noted opposition without speaking.

Ms. Brenda Frank of Willcox noted opposition without speaking.

Mr. John Kalas of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing concerns about light pollution as a member of the Tucson Amateur Astronomy Association. Mr. Kalas stated that he felt the proposal was inappropriate for the location in a pristine area. He cited further concerns about odor, sound, water, and security.

Ms. Nancy Radle of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing environmental impact concerns. She stated that the site was ecologically sensitive, and that the use would negatively impact the environment.

Mr. Jeffery Hoff of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing the residents' efforts to improve the local environment, and the belief that the proposal would negatively impact their efforts. Mr. Hoff expressed doubt regarding the Applicant's water calculations.

Ms. Catherine Martin of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing her research about environmental harm from large greenhouses. She cited issues with carbon dioxide, pesticides, water, contamination, and odor.

Mr. Michael Barnacastle of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing his business experience, and questioned the judgment of the Applicant. He spoke about the sensitive environment, and expressed concerns that the request would destroy the environment in Turkey Creek. Mr. Barnacastle expressed concerns about light pollution, water usage, traffic, and security.

Mr. Robert Smith of Pearce spoke in opposition, concurring with previous speakers' concerns. He stated that Turkey Creek Road would have to be paved, and after this was approved, there would be more. He expressed deep concern about fire and the condition of the roadways.

Ms. Marcia Greene of Pearce spoke in opposition, noting that they were the closest neighbors to the proposed site. She agreed with previous speakers, and cited concerns about viewsheds and property values.

Mr. Geoff Bender of Portal spoke in opposition, as the director of the Southwestern Research Field Station. Mr. Bender expressed concern about damage to the environment and to scientific research. He expressed doubt regarding the Applicant's ability to enact their water plans.

Mr. Casey Kendle of Pearce spoke in opposition, concurring with previous speakers.

Mr. Rod Keeling of Pearce spoke in opposition as a nearby vineyard and winery owner. He stated that he was a planner, developer, and revitalizer in Mesa and Tempe. Mr. Keeling stated that the community was more important than the Applicant's proposal. He cited the value of the local homes. Mr. Keeling argued that the facts were not brought forward, and staff made mistakes. He stated that the Commission would be doing the Applicant a favor by denying the request, threatening an expensive lawsuit from neighbors.

Mr. Robert Smith of Pearce noted opposition without speaking.

Ms. Taylor Clark of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing her efforts on water restoration. She disputed the Applicant's water report. She stated that the Turkey Creek area was identified as a high priority location for conservation easements.

Mr. Larry Greene of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing water and erosion concerns. He noted that any rainwater that the Applicant captured was water not flowing into the creek. Mr. Greene then expressed concern about the methodology of the support and opposition documents. Chairman Greene declared such criticism out of order.

Ms. Mary Louise Smith of Pearce spoke in opposition, citing concerns about the decreasing water table, noting that she had to haul water several times. Ms. Smith also expressed concern on behalf of her sister-in-law who also owned property in the area.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Greene invited the Applicant to rebut. Mr. DeBatty stated that the rainwater system was scalable for the entire project, and that the light pollution would be controlled by, motion controlled lighting and light deprivation systems for the greenhouse. He stated that they wanted to keep the beautiful existing guest ranch, and that there would be no noise from the greenhouse. Mr. DeBatty re-emphasized the odor filtering system, and stated that they would be adding to the restoration efforts. He addressed the security efforts, citing their expertise. He closed by emphasizing their charitable efforts, and thanked the neighbors for their input. Chairman Greene closed the Public Hearing. Mr. Watkins asked if the Applicant had looked at other locations in Cochise County. Mr. DeBatty stated that he had, but this site seemed best to them. Mr. Watkins expressed his feelings that canyons such as this were no appropriate for the foothill canyons. Chairman Greene asked about water usage from the pool at the guest ranch, and how that water was recycled. He then asked Staff if the Applicant were proposing any other crop would it be a Special Use. Ms. Drake answered that both the agriculture and the processing would be exempt under the current law and regulations. Chairman Greene then asked for Staff's recommendation. Ms. Drake thanked the audience for their concerns, and mentioned the Applicant's private property rights, and then recommended Conditional Approval. Chairman Greene thanked everyone for their time and energy, and then called for a motion. Ms. Weissler made a motion of Conditional Approval, with the Conditions recommended by Staff. Ms. Miller seconded the motion. Mr. Brauchla and Ms. Weissler expressed support for Mr. Watkins' position that the proposed location was inappropriate. Chairman Greene stated that he felt the regulations had been met, noting that any other crop would be exempt. Mr. Watkins stated that he felt that the State had put the Commission in a difficult position, but this location was not appropriate for an agricultural use. Ms. Miller stated that she appreciated the detail that the Applicant had put into their application, and the public had put into their concerns. She advocated a fix at the legislative level to correct the difficult position that the Commission was in. Mr. Borer stated that he felt the purpose of the Commission was to analyze each item as an individual request. Ms. Weissler stated that consistency was important, but individual circumstances were important. There being no further discussion, Chairman Greene called for a roll call vote on the motion. The motion failed, 1-6, with Chairman Greene in support.

Motion: Motioned to Approve the Docket with the Conditions recommended by Staff

Moved by: Ms. Weissler **Seconded by:** Ms. Miller

Vote: Motion failed (**Summary:** Yes = 1, No =6, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Mr. Greene

No: Ms. Miller, Mr. Brauchla, Mr. Borer, Ms. Weissler, Mr. Watkins, and Ms. Edie

Abstain: 0

1. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT, INCLUDING PENDING, RECENT AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' ACTIONS.

Report on April 12th Board of Supervisors meeting

- a. Abandonment of Foremost subdivision

**Next P&Z Commission meeting
May 11, 2016**

- a. SU-16-06 (Frazier) medical marijuana north of Elfrida
- b. SU-99-09 (Muhammad) revocation of SUP for airstrip in abandoned Foremost subdivision
- c. Special Use request for indoor recreation in Whetstone

Upcoming

- a. SU-16-09 (Kramme) request for Tire Aggregate Storage near Willcox
- b. Minor zoning regulation update

CALL TO COMMISSIONERS ON RECENT MATTERS:

None

ADJOURNMENT – Ms. Weissler moved to adjourn, Mr. Watkins seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 pm.